

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 94 04:30:15 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #638
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 7 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 638

Today's Topics:

440 in So. Cal. (2 msgs)
<<Wanted: CW reader for handi-ham>>
Anything Interesting in Atlanta
Ignition Noise Help Wanted
paKet 5.1

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 6 Jun 1994 21:29:25 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!nntp-
server.caltech.edu!news.claremont.edu!kaiwan.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:

> > Actually, what really happened was that the repeater you reference, CLARA,
> > first ***re-coordinated*** itself as CLOSED before commencement of the
> > lawsuits, in recognition of the weak grounds for barring specific hams
> > from an open repeater.

> I guess now FCC statements == weak ground.

Actually the legal "weak ground" is a county court issuing a restraining
order that pre-empts operator privileges granted by the Federal
Government. Personally, I side with CLARA and hope the decision stands
(I don't know if there will be an appeal, but if there is, I hope it

stands).

I also hope that CLARA re"opens". I understand that they are officially closed but aren't too restrictive as to who may use the repeater. I'm not sure, though, because I haven't tried it.

--

____[Robb Topolski]____[San Clemente, CA]____[topolski@kaiwan.com]____

Date: 6 Jun 1994 21:50:48 -0700

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!news.claremont.edu!kaiwan.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: 440 in So. Cal.

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hey Michael P. Deignan (md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu):

> I fail to see how their coordinated status makes a bit of difference.
> Regardless of whether or not a machine is "open" or "closed" the trustee
> has always had the right to restrict access to the machine. To suggest
> otherwise implies that you have the right to enter my home whenever you
> want and operate my HF station without my permission.

It makes a difference because they're asking an uneducated (ham-wise) county judge to make an order barring a federally licensed radio station operator from transmitting on frequencies assigned and permitted to that licensee. They asked the judge to overlook that in light of the defendant's continued use of a closed/private/restricted machine in defiance of the owners/operators of that equipment.

In any event, this case has already been argued and CLARA won.

> I can understand why a system would want to be re-coordinated as "closed".
> Proponents of "open" repeater systems seem to be under the impression
> that it's their right to utilize the machine whenever they feel like it,
> regardless of what the station owner says. At least if the machine is
> coordinated as "closed" it may help convey the fact that people who are
> not wanted on the machine by the trustee should not be operating on it.

I'm a proponent of open repeater systems but I don't feel that way. I've supported open repeater systems financially (and with my time) in the past and I will in the future. A good open repeater fosters goodwill. Like a big, puffy "WELCOME" mat -- an open repeater is a good place for you to dial up when you get lost in the big city or are just looking for a rag-chew because traffic is tied up. On the other hand, I have never belonged to a closed repeater system. Although I could use

APCO's closed system, I never even bothered to get the frequency because
-- quite frankly -- who cares? Are my friends going to monitor it? No.

> From the FCC's perspective, it doesn't make a damn bit of difference,
> since all repeaters are closed anyway in the eyes of the FCC.

"Open" never meant that the trustee didn't have the final say as to who
uses the system. It sounds like you think that the FCC has outlawed open
repeaters.

--
____[Robb Topolski]____[San Clemente, CA]____[topolski@kaiwan.com]____

Date: 6 Jun 1994 22:08:42 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!udel!
news.udel.edu!brahms.udel.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: <<Wanted: CW reader for handi-ham>>
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

My buddy N3MEQ approached me to help a fellow ham with a hearing problem.
He likes to contest a bit, uses NA, likes CW, and wants to try a code
reader. I used to have one.

Budget is limited. If you may know of a stand-alone code reader, like the
Kam or AEA, or have a software/hardware solution to reading some CW on the
screen while still in a contest type of mode, please let me know.

E-mail here is fine. Preferable address is penneys@pecan.cns.udel.edu.

Tnx Bob

--
Bob Penneys, WN3K Frankford Radio Club Internet: penneys@pecan.cns.udel.edu
Work: Ham Radio Outlet (Delaware) (800) 644-4476; fax (302) 322-8808
Mail at home: 12 East Mill Station Drive Newark, DE 19711 USA

Date: 6 Jun 1994 16:36:25 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
news1.oakland.edu!rcsuna.gmr.com!ilium!gdls.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Anything Interesting in Atlanta
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm going to be in Atlanta, GA for a few days at the end of the month.
Any interesting surplus shops/radio stores, etc. there?

Thanks

Bill

Date: 7 Jun 1994 00:47:34 GMT
From: eng.iac.honeywell.com!ws07.iac.honeywell.com!dphillips@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ignition Noise Help Wanted
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

HELP!

I am attempting to use my HF rig mobile in my 1988 Chevy Suburban. However, I have so much ignition noise as to make it not practical on the road.

I would like some suggestions on how to eliminate ignition noise in a Chevrolet using the high power ignition system with the Throttle Body Fuel Injection system.

I have already tried the following, none of which had much effect;

1. Isolated and grounded all feed line (RG8x) shields to the body.
2. Placed split ferrite cores on primary and each secondary ignition lead.
3. Added extra copper braid shield from body pannels and hood to frame.
4. Added extra copper braid shields from engine to frame.
5. Added extra copper braid shield engine block to coil frame.
6. Shortened primary radio power lead to nearest battery connection and used shielded cable.

This sucker is still LOUD. Also, I have noted that when another vehicle of the same make and model is near, I can hear them also quite clearly in my reciever. Has anyone out there run into this problem and found a reliable method of countering it ???????????????????

--

Dave Phillips	KB7JS		"Takeoffs are optional,
Phoenix, AZ, USA			Landings are mandatory"
dphillips@ips.iac.honeywell.com			

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 94 10:48:00 -0800
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!news.duke.edu!eff!
neoucom.edu!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!infinet!nitelog!
mario.campos@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: paKet 5.1
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Currently looking at the "paket 5.1" program from Australia. Is this the latest version of the program or is there an update available! If there is an update - where is it available for downloading? I do not have access to CIS!

Thanks for any information that you have to offer on "paKet 5.1" I have tried contacting the author, the USA lliason but no response from either of them for weeks now!

Mario....N6ALS

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 13:43:39 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2so39e\$t29@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<1994Jun5.013218.14136@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2sv13r\$e7a@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2sv13r\$e7a@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> jreese@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Jim Reese) writes:

>In article <1994Jun5.013218.14136@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,

>Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

>

>>This is where the classic frequency coordinator hat and the spectrum
>>management hat get tangled. Many coordinating bodies try to wear both
>>hats and there is a basic conflict.

>

>You are correct about this. Many coordination organizations do try to wear
>both hats. They find out that they are very good at coordination, but very
>bad at spectrum management. This is because _coordination_ is a _technical_
>field, and _spectrum management_ is a _political_ field.

That's exactly right. We're asking a body to manage a public resource to it's best utilization. That by it's nature requires value judgements be made, and that's always a political issue.

>>However, as spectrum managers, the body has to take into account the
>>interests of all of the amateur community, users as well as operators
>>of the designated repeater spectrum, in order to maximize the utility
>>of the limited public resource to *all* amateurs. This is a dynamic
>>role in a growing service.
>
>...and a role best suited for a group of coordination organizations working
>together with hams using all modes and frequencies to find the BEST political
>solution that everyone can live with. Knowing full well that everyone WON'T
>get everything they want.
>
>>It's in this latter role of establishing
>>public policy that most coordinating bodies fail to carry out their
>>responsibilities.
>
>...but unfortunately, the coordinators are the people most hams EXPECT to do
>the job. Nevermind that they don't know HOW to do it...It just wasn't needed
>as badly until recently.
>
>What IS needed is for someone at a national level to realize that spectrum
>management is political in nature and must be dealt with accordingly. The
>ARRL's lame attempts at spectrum management has been to get five people in
>a room and decide how best to plan the band for the entire nation...then ram
>that down all the coordinators' throats by printing that band plan in the
>repeater directory.

That's been the League leadership style for decades. Pronouncements from
on high of decisions made behind closed doors by select, unelected panels,
followed by attempts to impose them on everyone, often using FCC rulemakings
as a lever to enforce ARRL "leadership" will. Most amateurs who will be
affected only find out months after the fact by getting out the magnifying
glass and peering at the mice type in QST. That's not a satisfactory way
to run a representative policy body.

>I would love for the ARRL to make a really good try at spectrum management, but
>to do so will require them to admit that life exists above 30 MHz and west of
>the Mississippi river. They also need to realize that the needs are different
>in different areas, and a "national" bandplan simply isn't realistic. There
>will be differences around the country...and that's OK. I'm not sure the
>League is up to the task.

I don't know if the "League" is up to the task, if by "League" you mean
the staff in Newington or the Board of Directors, but the ARRL is some
260,000 people, slightly less than half of all US amateurs. Add in that
other 340,000 and surely there can be found sufficient talented people
to fill the locality spectrum management jobs. While spectrum management
issues vary from locality to locality, and spectrum managers should reflect

this by being elected locally by all amateurs in the area, there is a need for coordination of policy with neighboring management committees, otherwise there is bound to be conflict at the borders. That requires some national body to *arbitrate* (not rule from Olympus) the inevitable disputes. That role may fall, by default, to the ARRL's elected officials, if they're up to it.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 16:09:25 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sp2nb\$pnb@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <gregCqwoCC.HoD@netcom.com>,
<2stc0n\$4fc@nyx10.cs.du.edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2stc0n\$4fc@nyx10.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>In article <gregCqwoCC.HoD@netcom.com>, Greg Bullough <greg@netcom.com> wrote:

>>What isn't yours can't be taken away from you. The airwaves are a public
>>resource. The fact that you were in the park first doesn't mean that
>>you have the right to pitch your tent and make it your home.

>

>OTOH, you can't be deprived of the use of your property without compensation,
>either. If the FCC were to change its mind and say that all repeaters should
>be open, they'd most likely lose a suit charging they'd done exactly that.

Did the FCC compensate amateurs when they took away the 11 meter band?
Did they compensate amateurs when they recently pulled 2 MHz of the
220 MHz band? And did they further compensate *repeater owners* when they
withdrew a further segment of the 222 MHz band from repeater use at the
request of the ARRL? Are they planning to compensate amateurs when they
sell off the 2.3 GHz spectrum? In all cases the answer is no. Spectrum
management is a public policy issue since spectrum is public. No one is
guaranteed a bit of spectrum in perpetuity for their private use. If
changes in spectrum policy causes someone to lose the use of their
investment in equipment, too bad. The precedents have been set, channels
aren't forever.

>>Red-Baiting as a form of intelligent argument disappeared in the 1950's.
>>As a stupid diversionary tactic, it fell from favor in the 1970's.

>

>You're entitled to your opinion, of course. Just as I am entitled to my
>opinion: that you are determined to force repeater trustees to make their
>hard-earned incomes and labor available for you to use and abuse for no
>compensation and with no controls whatsoever.

No one is forced to become a repeater licensee, so no one is forced
to expend any funds or labor for someone else's benefit. Repeater
operation depends on usage of a public resource. It's incumbent on
such operators to offer an easement to allow all owners of the resource
access to it. That's common law. You can't legally put a gate across
a public road and start charging tolls, or denying access altogether.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 6 Jun 1994 21:56:01 -0700

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!nntp-
server.caltech.edu!news.claremont.edu!kaiwan.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun4.165326.8941@cs.brown.edu>, <2suau8\$cvj@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>,
<2sumnu\$1de@ccnet.ccnet.com>ed
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Bob Wilkins n6fri (rwilkins@ccnet.com) wrote:

> Would your group share the frequency with a group similar to yours or
> concider sharing with a 200 member group that already has a 2meter
> repeater. Most of the time the new 440 repeater is only simulcasting the
> 2meter repeater and has only three real users. The difference is that most
> of the amateurs heard on the frequency are not using the repeater but are
> imported from an other band.

Good point. Have you done this before? <g> 73, Robb

--

____[Robb Topolski]____[San Clemente, CA]____[topolski@kaiwan.com]____

Date: 6 Jun 1994 18:15:12 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!wizard.uark.edu!comp!plaws@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun4.081913.2429@hnrc.tufts.edu>, <2sq5np\$p2j@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<peterl.770887074@hood>aws
Subject : Re: FCC computers up!

peterl@hood.uucp (Peter Lee) writes:

>I can say that if the FCC thinks that they are doing great by processing
>300 apps a day, that is a crock of sh*t.

>I finally received my license after about 10-12 weeks of waiting, and will
>have to say that, as a reputable Mac/PC/UNIX computer consultant here in
>the Portland area, I am EXTREMELY disappointed with the fact that the FCC
>knows NOTHING about how to run an Information Systems department.

Information Systems **Person**. They have, last I heard, one Full Time
Equivalent doing the processing. Remember -- this is just a hobby ...

>-Peter B. Lee, EMT, KC7CJF

Peter C. Laws, ex-NREMT-P, N5UWY

Peter Laws <plaws@comp.uark.edu> | "Let's make sure history never forgets the
n5uwy@ka5bml.#nwar.ar.usa.noam | name ... Enterprise" ST:TNG - 1987-1994

Date: 6 Jun 1994 17:44:12 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ub!csn!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!
rkarlqu@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sf9oc\$jjk@cismsun.univ-lyon1.fr>, <CqoBJE.K96@hpmqmoa.sqf.hp.com>,
<jdow.770879025@bix.com>shu
Subject : Re: SSB Filters

In article <jdow.770879025@bix.com>, jdow on BIX <jdow@BIX.com> wrote:

>Um, 200ppm pretty much wants more than a simple varicap to make it happy. Even
>with carefully selected (and spurious de-Q-ed inductors) past 200ppm it is

>remarkably easy to get into odd spurious oscillations due to crystal spurs. As
>you mention, I'd never try pulling an overtone crystal farther than its base
>frequency tolerance at best. (I learned that one the hard way. Just barely
>made that one work.)
>
>{^_^} jdown@bix.com

Of course you need more than a simple varicap to get 200 ppm (see my previous post). I happened to need to build a 19.2 MHz. VCXO last week, and I had no trouble tuning 4000 ppm below series resonance and 2000 ppm above series resonance (that's a total of over 100 kHz.). When I tried to go above 2000 ppm on the high side, I did have some (predictable) trouble jumping to a spurious xtal response up there.

Rick Karlquist N6RK
rkarlqu@scd.hp.com

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 14:29:19 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2so39e\$t29@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <2su9ku\$asl@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>,
<1994Jun6.125335.12372@cs.brown.edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <1994Jun6.125335.12372@cs.brown.edu> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>
>Define an "open" repeater. If you say "a repeater which has no access
>restrictions" then you are contradicting the FCC, which has specifically
>stated that trustees have the right to say who may and may not use their
>repeater.

The FCC says the trustee has the "right" to say who may use his machine, but the FCC does not *require* the trustee to exercise that right to form an exclusionary clique. I have the "right" to shoot you if I find you on my property (make my day law), but that doesn't mean I'm *required* to shoot you, or that it's necessarily a good policy for me to do so. (Sorta cuts down on the number of new friends who might drop over for a visit without a formal invitation.)

I operate an open repeater because I'm tying up access to public property, a channel pair, and I feel an obligation to provide an easement so that all owners of that property can have free access to it. That does not mean that

I'll tolerate abusive illegal operations through the system, just as I retain the right to shoot people on my property if they leave the gates open or shoot the cattle, I'll track you down and deal with you if you mess with my system, but I do maintain an open door policy unless a person's actions suggest I have to deal specifically with them. I'd much rather the default be that I hold out the open hand of friendship, and only sic the dogs on you if you turn out not to want to be a friend.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #638
